

ELECTION RIGHTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

PROP

60

ARGUMENT Against Proposition 60

In his speech on the Conciliation of America, Edmund Burke said, “All government, indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter.”

The authors of Proposition 60 have compromised too much. They had the chance to permanently protect California’s primary system, but stopped short of the goal line.

Proposition 60 does allow parties that have candidates in primary elections to have a candidate in general elections. That’s some protection from radical schemes—but not enough.

Proposition 60 doesn’t spell out what kind of primary elections California will have.

That leaves the door open for future tinkering with the primary system and still allows the special interest backers of so-called “open primary” or “blanket primary” schemes to come in over and over again with new attempts to try and make changes that would harm our system.

Enough is enough. No political party should be forced to allow members of other parties to choose their nominees.

Proposition 60 could have amended the

California Constitution to permanently prevent primary schemes from being imposed in the future. It doesn’t.

As Californians, we want to see elections constitutionally protected from changes and from the opportunity for mischief.

A think tank in Washington State, where they have also wrestled with primary election issues, recently noted a survey taken in California when our primary was temporarily changed a few years back. It said 37% of the state’s Republicans planned to help determine the Democrat nominee for Governor and 20% of Democrats planned to vote in the Republican primary for Senate.

Proposition 60 could have permanently amended the California Constitution to prevent the opportunity for mischief. It doesn’t.

Proposition 60 is only half a response.

Proposition 60 does no harm, but voters deserve more. Voters deserve *permanent* protection for our primary system.

STATE SENATOR BILL MORROW

STATE ASSEMBLYMEMBER SARAH REYES

REBUTTAL to Argument Against Proposition 60

You know full, free, and open debate is important in a democracy. We have nothing to fear from hearing different points of view. Proposition 60 protects your right to choice in elections.

Proposition 60 protects your right to choose political parties’ candidates for public office.

Proposition 60 is simple, straightforward, and easily understood. That is in sharp contrast to Proposition 62, which would impose Louisiana’s radical election system where voters’ choice in a recent runoff election was a former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan and a corrupt governor who later went to prison.

- Proposition 62’s proponents are very wealthy politicians intent on forcing their Louisiana scheme on Californians because they know they, and others like them, will personally benefit. The two most wealthy candidates will be able to buy victory in the first round of voting,

making campaign finance reform meaningless.

- Proposition 62 would create a two-stage general election in which only the two top vote getters in a first round of voting would be allowed to participate in a runoff election—even if they belong to the same party! By keeping candidates out of general elections, it would reduce voter choice in the only vote in which a candidate could actually win office.

Proposition 60 preserves voter choice.

Vote Yes on Proposition 60!

BARBARA O’CONNOR, Ph.D., *Director
Institute for the Study of Politics & Media
California State University, Sacramento*

MICHAEL S. CARONA, *Sheriff
Orange County*

HENRY L. “HANK” LACAYO, *State President
Congress of California Seniors*